# Case3:05-cv-03772-JSW Document1 Filed09/19/05 Page1 of 28

1	PAUL L. REIN, Esq. (SBN 43053) PATRICIA BARBOSA, Esq. (SBN 12586	55)
2	JULIE MCLEAN, Esq. (SBN 215202) LAW OFFICES OF PAUL L. REIN	
3	200 Lakeside Drive, Suite A Oakland, CA 94612	
4	(510) 832-5001	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER	
6		
7	UNITED STATES D	אדפיית ראוותיי
8	NORTHERN DISTRIC	
9		
10	SHARON LETCHER	CASE NO.
11	Plaintiff,	<u>Civil Rights</u>
12	v.	COMPLAINT FOR DENIAL OF DISABLED
13	•	ACCESS TO DISABLED PERSONS IN VIOLATION OF TITLE II AND TITLE
14	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	III OF THE AMERICANS WITH
15	FRANCISCO; BOARD OF TRUSTEES SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND	DISABILITIES ACT; VIOLATION OF \$504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT
16	PERFORMING ARTS CENTER; SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC.;	OF 1973; VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE §4450 ET SEQ;
17	SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY; and DOES 1-25, Inclusive,	VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §§51, 52, 54 AND 54.1; VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH
18	Defendants.	AND SAFETY CODE §§ 19952, 19955, et seq. AND RELATED CODES AND
19		REGULATIONS
20		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
21		DIFFIND TON CONT TRAINE
22	Plaintiff SHARON LETCHE	CR complains that defendants
23	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;	BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN
24	FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFOR	RMING ARTS CENTER; SAN
25	FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC.; SAN	FRANCISCO SYMPHONY; and DOES
26	1-25, (hereinafter "defendants"),	have denied her and continue
27	to deny her "full and equal acces	ss" to the public

accommodations, business establishment, and goods and services

LAW OFFICES OF PAUL L. REIN 200 LAKESIDE DR., SUITE A OAKLAND, CA 94612-3503 (510) 832-5001

offered to the general public, at the Davies Symphony Hall located in San Francisco, California, because of her physical disability, in violation of Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act and California civil rights laws and regulations, and hereby more particularly alleges as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER is a "person with a disability" or "physically handicapped person," who requires the use of a wheelchair for mobility and is unable to use portions of public facilities that are not accessible to disabled persons who require the use of a wheelchair.
- 2. INTRODUCTION: This case involves the denial of accessible facilities and a failure to modify policies and procedures to provide full and equal access to plaintiff SHARON LETCHER at the Davies Symphony Hall in San Francisco, California. The property at issue in this action is owned and operated and/or leased by the City and County of San Francisco through its Trustees for the San Francisco War Memorial and Performing Arts Center. Defendants San Francisco Performances, Inc. and the San Francisco Symphony are operators and lessors of the property and offer concert performances to the general public.
- 3. This action is limited to Davies Hall and its related public facilities including public entrances, paths of travel, public restrooms, disabled seating in the theater, and defendants' policies and practices in providing their programs, goods, and services to disabled persons at Davies Hall. Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER alleges that she was denied her civil rights under both California law and federal law because of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

### Case3:05-cv-03772-JSW Document1 Filed09/19/05 Page3 of 28

defendants' discriminatory policy of refusing to provide proper wheelchair accessible seating for patrons who purchase Senior Package tickets for the San Francisco Symphony's performances. Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER is deterred from returning to the Davies Symphony Hall until such time as defendants' discriminatory policies are modified, and the facilities are made fully accessible. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to require defendants to modify their policies and procedures to provide their goods and services and "programs, services, and activities" to disabled persons such as plaintiff without discrimination; and to make their facilities accessible to disabled persons as required by law. In the alternative, plaintiff seeks to enjoin the subject facilities from operating as a place of "public accommodation" or "business establishment" so long as it discriminates against plaintiff and other persons with disabilities. Plaintiff also seeks recovery of damages for her discriminatory experiences and for the denial of access that resulted from defendants' discriminatory policies and failure to provide accessible facilities for the eight concert senior citizen tickets she purchased for the 2003-2004 concert series. Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER also seeks recovery of statutory attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs, under federal law and California law.

4. **JURISDICTION:** This Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 USC §1331 for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"). (42 USC §12101 et seq.) Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, attendant and related

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

causes of action arising from the same facts are also brought under California law, including but not limited to violations of California Government Code §4450 et seq.; California Civil Code §§ 51, 52, 54, 54.1 and 55; California Health & Safety Code §§ 19952, 19955 et seq., including §19959; and California Code of Regulations Title 24-2 (hereinafter "Title 24").

- 5. **VENUE:** Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 USC 1391(b) because the subject property is located in this district and plaintiff's causes of action arose here.
- 6. **INTRADISTRICT:** This case should be assigned to the San Francisco/Oakland intradistrict, where the subject property is located and where plaintiff's causes of action arose.
- 7. PARTIES: Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER is a "qualified" physically disabled person due to multiple sclerosis who requires use of a wheelchair for mobility. The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS CENTER; SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC.; SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY; and DOES 1-25, Inclusive, are the owners, operators, lessors, and lessees of the property, building, facilities, and business establishment known as "Davies Symphony Hall" located at Grove and Van Ness, San Francisco, California.
- 8. Defendants are subject to Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, to \$504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to the requirements of California State law requiring full and equal access to publicly funded facilities pursuant to Government Code \$4450 et seq., Health

PAUL L. REIN

200 LAKESIDE DR., SUITE A

OAKLAND, CA 94612-3503 (510) 832-5001

and Safety Code §§19952, 19953, 19955 et seq., and elsewhere, including Civil Code §§51, 52, 54, 54.1, and 54.2.

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore
alleges that the specified public facilities owned and maintained
by defendants, The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; BOARD OF
TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS
CENTER; SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC.; SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY
and DOES 1 through 25, Inclusive, are buildings, structures or
related facilities within the meaning of California Government
Code §§4450, 4451 and Health & Saf. Code §§ 19952, 19953, 19955
and 19956-19959. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and
thereon allege that the defendants, The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO; BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL
AND PERFORMING ARTS CENTER; SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC.; SAN
FRANCISCO SYMPHONY DOES 1 through 25, Inclusive, have
constructed, altered, or repaired parts of these public
buildings, structures and facilities since original construction
in 1980 and since they were first constructed within the meaning
of California Government Code §§4450, 4451 and 4456, Health &
Safety Code §§ 19956 and 19959, thereby requiring provision of
access to persons with disabilities; and since 1992 within the
meaning of Titles II and III of the ADA, requiring a modification
of policies and procedures to ensure that the goods and services
offered to the general public, including special programs for
seniors, are provided to persons with disabilities with full and
equal access. An award of statutory attorney fees, litigation
expenses and costs, including but not limited to public interest
attorney fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §

1021.5 are sought by plaintiff.

The establishment known as the Davies Symphony Hall is also operated as a "public accommodation" and "business entity" subject to the requirements of California Health & Safety Code §§19952, 19953 and 19955 et seq. and of California Civil Code §§ 51, 51.5, 52, 54 and 54.1, et seq. On information and belief, such facilities have, since initial construction in 1980, undergone additional construction and/or "alterations, structural repairs, or additions," subjecting all such buildings and facilities to disabled access requirements pursuant to Health & Safety Code \$19952-19959, et seq. information and belief Davies Hall has also undergone significant alterations and renovations since January 26, 1993 subjecting defendants to the obligations of Title II and III to modify their policies and procedures to ensure that the programs, services, activities and goods offered to the public are offered to persons with disabilities in a full and equal manner.

11. The true names and capacities of Does 1 through 25, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the defendants herein designated as Doe 1-25 is legally responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein referred to and caused injury and damages proximately thereby to plaintiff; plaintiff prays leave of Court to amend this Complaint to show such true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	12. Defendants The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; BOARD
2	OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING
3	ARTS CENTER; SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC.; SAN FRANCISCO
4	SYMPHONY and DOES 1-25, inclusive, are and were the owners,
5	operators, lessors and lessees of the subject property,
6	buildings, facilities and business establishment at all relevant
7	times. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the
8	defendants herein is the agent, employee or representative of
9	each of the other defendants, and performed all acts and
10	omissions stated herein within the scope of such agency or
11	employment or representative capacity and is responsible in some
12	manner for the acts and omissions of the other defendants in
13	proximately causing the damages complained of herein.
14	13. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend her Complaint when
15	the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities
16	of defendants The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; BOARD OF
17	TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of defendants The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS CENTER; SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC.; SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY; and DOES 1-25, inclusive, are ascertained.

References to "Defendants," unless otherwise specified, shall be deemed to refer to all defendants and each of them.

22

24

25

18

19

20

21

## 23 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR DENIAL OF FULL AND EQUAL ACCESS TO A PLACE OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION (Civil Code §§ 54, 54.1, et seq.; Health & Safety Code §§ 19952, 19953 and 19955 et seq.)

26

27

28

14. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the factual allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 13, above, and

incorporates them herein by reference as if separately repled hereafter.

15. STATUTORY PROVISIONS: Government Code \$\$4450 et seq. were enacted to ensure "that all buildings, structures, sidewalks, curbs, and related facilities constructed in this state by the use of state, county or municipal finds... shall be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities." Government Code § 4456 requires that any publicly funded "building or facility" altered, structurally repaired or added to after November 13, 1968 be "accessible to and useable by persons with disabilities." On information and belief, Davies Hall was originally constructed in 1980, and has undergone significant "alterations, structural repairs and additions" that triggered disabled access under Title 24, California Code of Regulations, which was in effect at the time of each alteration which, on information and belief, occurred at such public facility since January 1, 1982, thus requiring access complying with the specifications of Title 24 whenever each such "alteration, structural repair or addition" was carried out. Such "alterations, structural repairs or additions" included a major structural and interior renovation in 1992. Section 4450ff Government Code and Title 24-2 also impose additional access requirements with which defendants have not complied, including accessible wheelchair and companion seating in Davies Hall. On information and belief, construction and alterations occurred after January 26, 1992, which also triggered access requirements under the standards and regulations for implementing Titles II and III of the ADA,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

including the obligation for defendants to provide their senior citizen programs and tickets so that such programs are accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.

California Civil Code §54.1 states that individuals with disabilities are "entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to accommodations, advantages, facilities...places of public accommodations, amusement, or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law...and applicable alike to all persons." Health and Safety Code 19952 provides that theaters, concert halls, and stadiums "shall provide seating or accommodations for physically disabled persons in a variety of locations within the facility...so as to provide these persons a choice of admission prices otherwise available to members of the general public." Health & Safety Code §§ 19955 and 19955.5 were enacted "To ensure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with §4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code." California Code of Regulations, Title 24-2 ("Title 24-2") was in effect at the time of each alteration which occurred at such public facility since July 1, 1982, additionally requiring access complying with the specifications of Title 24-2 whenever any construction, "alteration, structural repair or addition" was performed. All such constructions and/or alterations were carried out by the current defendant owners or operators, or by their predecessors in interest, whose acts and omissions are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

the continuing and current responsibility of all current owners, operators, lessors and lessees.

- 17. FACTUAL STATEMENT: Plaintiff Sharon Letcher is a physically disabled person as the result of multiple sclerosis. During the summer of 2004, Plaintiff received information from defendants advertising a special series of concert tickets for Davies Symphony Hall available for senior citizen at a discounted rate for the 2004-2005 season. After receiving this information plaintiff called the ticket box office for Davies Symphony Hall requesting information concerning accessible and companion seating and was told it was available. Plaintiff thereafter purchased a set of eight (8) concert tickets under defendants' special program for senior citizens for her and a companion. She informed the ticket seller that she was physically disabled.
- 18. Plaintiff thereafter received concert tickets from defendants with the first concert ticket scheduled for October 14, 2004. On or about October 14, 2004, plaintiff went in her wheelchair to the Davies Hall for the first concert of her series tickets. When plaintiff arrived she went to find the seat indicated on her ticket, in 2 Tier E, seats 9 and 11, only to find that her assigned seats was located down two steps from the aisle way. Plaintiff contacted the usher and informed her that she could not use the seats assigned to her because they were not accessible to her in her wheelchair. Defendants' employees contacted plaintiff and offered plaintiff an available accessible seat in the orchestra section. Plaintiff accepted this offer and was taken by employees to the orchestra

section. On information and belief the public path of travel from the lobby to the orchestra section is dangerously steep with a slope far exceeding the maximum 8.3% slope allowed by law. An "alternate" path of to the orchestra section, through an employee area and back hallways, is also inaccessible for disabled persons with excessive slopes and cross slopes, inaccessible doorways and no signage. The designated "accessible" seating in the orchestra seating is also not properly located or configured, and is not located adjacent to the designated companion seating.

- During the week following the October 14th concert 19. plaintiff called defendants to let defendants know that the remaining seven senior citizen concert tickets in her concert package were not for accessible seats, and to ask defendants to reassign her seats to an accessible location. Defendants' employee informed plaintiff that if she wanted accessible seats she could purchase tickets in the orchestra section, but she would have to pay for orchestra seats at a much higher rate than the rate for the special "Senior Citizen" tickets. Plaintiff was not willing to pay the additional cost and asked to be accommodated. Defendants informed plaintiff that she could return the tickets for inaccessible seats. Plaintiff returned the tickets for the remaining seven (7) concerts and was not able to attend the concert series she had paid for because she was assigned inaccessible seats.
- 20. On information and belief, although there may be "accessible" seating facilities at the Davies Hall, defendants have failed to modify their policies and procedures to ensure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

that the accessible seating is available for disabled guests. On information and belief, the accessible seats are sold to able-bodied persons without reserving or giving disabled persons equal opportunity to purchase accessible seats. For example, although able-bodied quests may purchase tickets via the Internet or through ticket services such as Ticket Master, persons needing disabled accessible seats cannot purchase tickets except through the box office, with limited hours and access. As a result of this policy, accessible seats are not reserved for disabled use and are instead sold via ticket agents and the internet to able-bodied quests. Therefore, when plaintiff sought to exchange her tickets, she could not be provided any accessible seats in accessible locations because, on information and belief they had all been sold to able-bodied persons instead of being reserved for use by disabled persons. The only remaining seats were those in the orchestra section for much higher cost.

21. In addition to the discriminatory policy of refusing to provide wheelchair seating to patrons who purchase Senior Package tickets, and the discriminatory policy of failing to reserve accessible seats, on information and belief, the facilities are inaccessible to persons with disabilities in other aspects, including, but not limited to, seating in the front orchestra seats that is not correctly sized and located for use by a wheelchair patron and his or her guest, and an inaccessible path of travel to this seating, rendering such facilities inaccessible to and unusable by plaintiff and other mobility disabled persons. Defendants must be enjoined from

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

maintaining a discriminatory policy of refusing to provide accessible wheelchair seating to patrons who purchase Senior Package tickets; modifying their policies and procedures to allow disabled persons the same opportunity to purchase accessible seats in a variety of locations at a variety of prices; and to require that all facilities at the subject property be brought into compliance with all applicable federal and state requirements for disabled access.

- 22. Further, each and every violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), (as pled in the Fourth Cause of Action, the contents of which are repled and incorporated herein, word for word, as if separately repled), also constitutes a separate and distinct violation of California Civil Code §\$54(c) and 54.1(d), thus independently justifying an award of damages as to defendants San Francisco Performances, Inc. and San Francisco Symphony only, per §54.3 and injunctive relief pursuant to California law, including but not limited to §55 Civil Code and §19953 Health and Safety Code, as to all defendants.
- 23. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to prohibit the acts and omissions of defendants as complained of herein which are continuing and which have the effect of wrongfully excluding plaintiff and other members of the public who are physically disabled wheelchair users from full and equal access to these public facilities. Such acts and omissions are the cause of humiliation and mental and emotional suffering of plaintiff SHARON LETCHER in that these actions continue to treat her as an inferior and second class citizen

and serve to discriminate against her on the sole basis that she is a person with disabilities who requires the use of a wheelchair for movement in public places. Plaintiff is unable to achieve equal access to and use of these public facilities so long as such acts and omissions of defendants continue. acts of defendants have proximately caused and will continue to cause irreparable injury to plaintiff if not enjoined by this Court.

- Wherefore plaintiff asks this Court to preliminarily and permanently enjoin any continuing refusal by defendants to grant full and equal access to plaintiff in the respects complained of and to require defendants to comply forthwith with the applicable statutory requirements relating to access for disabled persons, or, alternatively, to close their inaccessible facilities to the public and cease to operate their business in a discriminatory manner. Such injunctive relief is provided by Health & Safety Code \$19953 and California Civil Code §55, and other law.
- The actions and omissions of Defendants, the CITY AND 25. COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS CENTER and DOES 1 through 25, Inclusive, as herein alleged, constitute a denial of access to and use of the described public facilities owned or operated by a public entity for the use of physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Government Code \$4450 et seq. and Health & Safety Code §§ 19955 et. seq. As a proximate result of Defendants' the CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

PERFORMING ARTS CENTER and DOES 1 through 25, Inclusive, actions and omissions, Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Government Code §\$4450 et seq., Health & Safety Code §\$ 19955 et seq. and of Title 24 regulations adopted to implement California law.

- 26. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law, and unless the relief requested herein is granted, Plaintiff will continue to suffer discrimination and to be deterred from using defendants' public accommodations as a result of Defendants' failure to fulfill their obligations to provide meaningful access to the Davies Symphony Hall and its related public accommodations.
- 27. DAMAGES: As to Defendants SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC. and THE SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY. As a result of defendants' discriminatory policy and the denial of equal access to the facility due to the acts and omissions of defendants and each of them in owning, operating, leasing, constructing, altering, and maintaining the subject public facilities, plaintiff suffered a violation of her civil rights including but not limited to rights under Civil Code §§ 54 and 54.1, and, on information and belief, suffered mental and emotional distress, embarrassment and humiliation, all to her damages as hereinafter stated. Defendants' actions and omissions to act constitute discrimination against plaintiff on the sole basis that she was and is physically disabled and unable, because of the discriminatory policies and architectural barriers created and/or maintained by the defendants in violation of the subject laws, to use the public facilities on a full and equal basis as other persons.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Plaintiff also seeks trebling of all actual damages, general and special, as provided by Civil Code §54.3.

- 28. TREBLE DAMAGES: As to Defendants SAN FRANCISCO
  PERFORMANCES, INC. and THE SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY: On
  information and belief, defendants have exhibited a conscious
  disregard for the rights of plaintiff and other disabled
  persons, which justifies treble damages pursuant to Civil Code
  \$54.3. Defendants' intentional and discriminatory policy of
  refusing to provide accessible wheelchair seating to patrons
  who purchase Senior Package tickets, and their refusal to
  accommodate plaintiff by providing her accessible seats for the
  seven remaining "senior series" concerts, evidences intentional
  discrimination and conscious disregard for the rights of
  disabled persons.
- 29. FEES AND COSTS: As a result of defendants' acts and omissions, plaintiff has been required to incur attorney fees, litigation expenses, and costs as provided by statute, in order to enforce plaintiff's rights and to enforce provisions of the law protecting access for disabled persons and prohibiting discrimination against disabled persons. Plaintiff therefore seeks recovery of all reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses, and costs, pursuant to the provisions of Civil Code \$\$ 54.3 and 55 and Health and Safety Code \$19953. Additionally, plaintiff's lawsuit is intended to force the defendants to modify their discriminatory policies and to make their facilities accessible to all disabled members of the public, justifying "public interest" attorney fees, litigation expenses

1	and costs pursuant to the provisions of §1021.5 Code of Civil
2	Procedure and other applicable law.
3	Wherefore plaintiff prays for relief as hereinafter
4	stated.
5	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:
6	VIOLATION OF UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §§ 51 AND 52,
7	DENIAL OF FULL AND EQUAL ACCOMMODATION IN A BUSINESS ESTABLISHMENT ON THE BASIS OF DISABILITY
8	30. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as
9	if fully set forth again herein, the factual allegations
LO	contained in Paragraphs 1 through 29, above, and incorporates
L1	them herein by reference as if separately repled hereafter.
L2	31. At all times herein mentioned, the Unruh Civil Rights
L3	Act, California Civil Code §51(b), provided that:
L4	All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free
L5	and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color religion, ancestry, national origin, disability or medical
L6	condition are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or
L7	services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.
L8	Pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §51(f),
L9	A violation of the right of any individual under the
20	Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101- 336) shall also constitute a violation of this section.
21	32. Defendants' theater facilities are a "business
22	establishment" subject to Cal. Civil Code §51(b). Plaintiff
23	suffered damages as above described as a result of defendants'
24	violation of California Civil Code §§ 51(b) and 51(f) in
25	multiple respects, including but not limited to violations of
26	the ADA, as described in the Third Cause of Action, infra, the
27	contents of which cause of action are incorporated herein as if

separately repled. California Civil Code §52(a) provides that

each such violation entitles plaintiff to "the actual damages, and any amount that may be determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the amount of actual damage but in no case less than four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and any attorney's fees that may be determined by the court in addition thereto..."

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for damages as to Defendants SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC. and THE SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY only and injunctive relief as to all defendants, as hereinafter stated.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

# VIOLATION OF TITLE III OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (42 USC §12101FF): PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN A PLACE OF ACCOMMODATION ON THE BASIS OF DISABILITY

- 33. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 32 of this Complaint, and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.
- 34. In 1990 the United States Congress made findings per 42 USC \$12101 regarding physically disabled persons, finding that laws were needed to more fully protect "some 43 million Americans [with] one or more physical or mental disabilities;" that had historically been isolated and segregated by society and that "the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous..."

1	35. Congress stated as its purpose in passing the
2	Americans with Disabilities Act (42 USC §12101(b))
3	It is the purpose of this act
4	(1) to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals
5	with disabilities;
6	(2) to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals
7	with disabilities;
8	(3) to ensure that the Federal government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in this act or behalf of individuals with disabilities; and
10	(4) to invoke the sweep of Congressional authority,
11	including the power to enforce the 14th Amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of
12	discrimination faced day to day by people with disabilities. (Emphasis added)
13	36. As part of the Americans with Disabilities Act,
14	Public Law 101-336, (hereinafter the "ADA"), Congress passed
15	"Title III - Public Accommodations and Services Operated by
16	Private Entities" (42 USC 12181ff). The subject property and
17	facility is one of the "private entities" which are considered
18	"public accommodations" for purposes of Title III (42 USC
19	12181(7)), including but not limited to:
20	a motion picture house, theater, concert hall, stadium or other place of exhibition or entertainment (42 USC
21	12181(7)(C))
22	and
23	an auditorium, convention center, lecture hall, or other place of public gathering (42 USC 12181(7)(D)).
24	place of pasticing (if occ file), (if the pasticine is a second of the pas
25	37. Pursuant to 42 USC §12182(a), "No individual shall be
26	discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full
27	and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities,
28	privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of

1	public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or leases
2	to, or operates a place of public accommodation."
3	38. The specific prohibitions against discrimination
4	included:
5	A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies,
6	practices or procedures when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities,
7	<pre>privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; (42 USC (12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).)</pre>
8	A failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied
9	service, segregated, or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids
10	and services; (42 USC (12182(b)(A)(iii).)
11	A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communication barriers that are structural in nature, in
12	existing facilities where such removal is readily achievable; (42 USC (12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).)
13	Where an entity can demonstrate that the removal of a
14	barrier under clause (iv) is not readily achievable, a failure to make such goods, services, facilities,
15	privileges, advantages, or accommodations available through alternative methods if such methods are readily
16	achievable." The acts and omissions of Defendants set forth herein were in violation of Plaintiff's rights under
17	the ADA, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 CFR Part 36ff. (42 USC (12182(b)(2)(A)(v).)
18	Oliviale 3011. (12 000 (12102 (2) (1) (V).)
19	39. Defendants' failure to modify their policies and
20	practices and their failure to take steps necessary to ensure
21	that plaintiff and other similarly disabled persons were not
22	excluded, denied services or were otherwise treated differently
23	because of their disability is a violation of Title III of the
24	ADA.
25	40. Further, the removal of each of the barriers
26	complained of by plaintiff as hereinabove alleged, was at all
27	times "readily achievable" under the standards and regulations

established by the Department of Justice to implement Title III

of the ADA. As noted hereinabove, removal of each and every one of the architectural barriers complained of herein was also required under California law due to "alterations, structural repairs, or additions." Further, on information and belief, alterations to existing facilities since January 26, 1992 have also independently triggered requirements for removal of barriers to access for disabled persons pursuant to 42 USC \$12183.

- 41. On information and belief, as of the date of plaintiff's encounter at the premises and the filing of this Complaint, the premises have denied and continue to deny full and equal access to plaintiff and to other disabled persons, including wheelchair users, in other respects, which violated plaintiff's rights to full and equal access and which discriminated against plaintiff on the basis of her disability, thus wrongfully denying to plaintiff the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations, and in treating plaintiff differently because of her disability in violation of the ADA. (42 USC \$12182)
- 42. Pursuant to §308 of the ADA [42 USC 12188ff],
  Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies and procedures set forth
  in §204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC 2000(a)3(a), as plaintiff is being subjected to discrimination on the
  basis of her disability in violation of Title III and has
  reasonable grounds for believing that she will continue to be
  discriminated against in violation of the ADA. On information
  and belief, defendants have continued to maintain their

discriminatory policies and have continued to violate the law;
denying plaintiff and other disabled persons access to this
public accommodation since on or before October 2004. Pursuant
to §308(a)(2), injunctive relief involving cases of violations
of $\$302(b)(2)(A)(iv)$ and $\$303(a)$ shall include an order to make
such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals
with disabilities and to require the modification of a policy
to the extent required by Title III.

43. Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to remedies set forth in \$204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, (42 USC 2000(a)-3(a)), and pursuant to Federal Regulations adopted to implement the ADA. Plaintiff is a qualified person for purposes of the ADA (42 USC \$12188) who is being subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability in violation of Title III and who has reasonable grounds for believing she will be subjected to such discrimination each time that she may attempt to use the subject facilities. Plaintiff remains deterred from returning to such facilities by defendants' discriminatory policies and inaccessible facilities.

Wherefore plaintiff prays for relief as hereinafter stated.

1.3

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF TITLE II OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 AGAINST DEFENDANTS THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS CENTER

2.8

44. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth hereafter, the allegations contained in

Complaint for Injunctive Relief and Damages

paragraphs 1 through 43 of this complaint and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.

- 45. Effective January 26, 1992, Plaintiff was entitled to the protections of the "Public Services" provision of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Title II, Subpart A prohibits discrimination by any "public entity", including any state or local government, as defined by 42 USC \$12131, section 201 of the ADA.
- 46. Pursuant to 42 USC §12132, Section 202 of Title II, no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity. Plaintiff was at all times relevant herein a qualified individual with a disability as therein defined.
- 47. The defendant government entities have failed in their responsibilities as owners and operators of the subject public facilities under Title II to provide their services, programs and activities in a full and equal manner to disabled persons as described hereinabove, including but not limited to: failing to insure availability of accessible seating at Davies Hall for use by persons with physical disabilities; by failing to remove known architectural barriers at the subject facilities so as to render them accessible to physically disabled persons; and by implementing discriminatory policies in the sale of tickets for Senior Package patrons and other disabled patrons. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions and omissions, Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff, in violation of Title II of

the ADA, and of the regulations adopted to implement the ADA.

- 48. On information and belief, Defendants have further violated C.F.R § 35.151, regulations implementing the ADA, by altering the Theatre in 1992 without ensuring that the altered portions of the facility was "readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities."
- 49. As a result of such discrimination, in violation of §202 of the ADA, Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies, procedures and rights set forth in Section 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 USC §794a). Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to require Defendants to remove the barriers to access complained of, and seeks statutory attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs, according to proof.
- 50. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: To the date of filing this complaint, the facilities at Davies Hall continue to be inaccessible to persons with disabilities such as Plaintiff. Further, defendants continue their discriminatory policy of selling "accessible seating" tickets on the internet and via ticket agents to able-bodied persons, which policy results in the loss of wheelchair accessible seating for "Senior Package" patrons. Plaintiff requests that an injunction be ordered requiring Defendants to take prompt action to modify the aforementioned public facilities and policies to render them accessible to and usable by plaintiff and other similarly situated physically disabled persons, and to discontinue their discriminatory ticket sale policies.

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that the court grant relief as requested hereinbelow.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

fully set forth hereafter, the allegations contained in

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF \$504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if

2

1

3

5 6

4

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

Paragraphs 1 through 50 of this complaint and incorporates them herein as if separately repled. Defendants, The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS CENTER are governmental agencies existing under

and Performing Arts Center, including the Davies Hall facilities. Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore allege that

the laws of the State of California with responsibility for the

public accommodations throughout the San Francisco War Memorial

Defendants, The CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the BOARD OF

TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO WAR MEMORIAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

CENTER; and DOES 1 through 25, Inclusive, are recipients of Federal financial assistance and that part of that financial

assistance is used to fund the operations, construction and/or

maintenance of the specific public facilities described herein,

and the activities which take place therein.

53. By their actions or inactions in denying disabled accessible facilities at the public facilities specified herein, defendants have violated Plaintiff's rights under \$504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 USC §794, and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

54. By their actions or inactions in denying to Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER her right to have equal access to the same programs, activities and environment as non-disabled persons, and

by otherwise discriminating against Plaintiff solely by reason of
her physical disabilities, Defendants and each of them have
violated Plaintiff's rights under §504 of the Rehabilitation Act
of 1973 and the regulations promulgated thereunder. Plaintiff
seeks 1) injunctive relief through a Court order requiring
Defendants to correct the access deficiencies complained of
herein so that Plaintiff will not continue to be discriminated
against and/or deterred from entering and accessing the many
public accommodations in Davies Hall on the same basis as
non-disabled persons and 2) recovery of statutory attorney fees,
litigation expenses and costs.

Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law, and unless the relief requested herein is granted, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable injury by the deprivation of meaningful access to the public performances and programs at Davies Symphony Hall and related public facilities operated by Defendants therein.

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays the court grant relief as requested hereinbelow.

PRAYER

Issue a preliminary and permanent injunction

directing defendants as current owners, operators, lessors,

discriminatory policy regarding the sale and reservation of

facilities so that each provides full and equal access to

persons with disabilities; and issue a preliminary and

tickets to Davies Hall performances, and to modify their public

and/or lessees of the subject premises to modify their

Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER prays that this Court:

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

#### 20

# 21

## 22

# 23

# 24

#### 25

#### 26

27

OAKLAND, CA 94612-3503 (510) 832-5001

permanent injunction enjoining defendants from maintaining a
discriminatory policy and requiring defendants to provide
accessible facilities for plaintiff and similarly disabled
persons; or in the alternative, directing defendants to close
their business establishment and cease to operate as a public
accommodation or business establishment until such time as the
facilities are made accessible to persons with disabilities;
2. Retain jurisdiction over defendants until such time
as the Court is satisfied that defendants' unlawful policies,

- 2. Retain jurisdiction over defendants until such time as the Court is satisfied that defendants' unlawful policies, practices, acts and omissions, and maintenance of inaccessible public facilities as complained of herein no longer occur, and cannot recur;
- 3. Award to Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER all appropriate damages from Defendants SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMANCES, INC. and THE SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY, and Does 1-10, including but not limited to statutory damages, general damages and treble damages in an amount within the jurisdiction of the Court, all according to proof;
- 4. Award to plaintiff all reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses, and costs of this proceeding as provided by law; and
- 5. Grant such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: September 19, 2005

PAUL L. REIN

PATRICIA BARBOSA

JULIE MCLEAN

LAW OFFICES OF PAUL L. REIN

/s/ Paul L. Rein Attorneys for Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER

1.3

1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
2	Plaintiff hereby demands a jury for all claims for
3	which a jury is permitted.
4	
5	Dated: September 19, 2005 PAUL L. REIN PATRICIA BARBOSA
6	JULIE MCLEAN LAW OFFICES OF PAUL L. REIN
7	LAW OFFICES OF PAUL L. REIN
8	/a/ Dayl I Doin
9	/s/ Paul L. Rein Attorneys for Plaintiff
10	SHARON LETCHER
11	
12	CERTIFICATION OF INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PARTIES
13	Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-16, the undersigned
14	certifies that as of this date, other than the named parties
15	there is no such interest to report.
16	
17	Dated: September 19, 2005 PAUL L. REIN PATRICIA BARBOSA
18	JULIE MCLEAN LAW OFFICES OF PAUL L. REIN
19	DAW OFFICES OF TAGE I. NEIN
20	/s/ Paul L. Rein
21	Attorneys for Plaintiff SHARON LETCHER
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	